



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/803,374	03/18/2004	Narayan P. Menon	42P11564C2	5487

7590 02/24/2006
Mark C Van Ness
12400 Wilshire Blvd
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025

EXAMINER CANGIALOSI, SALVATORE A	
ART UNIT 3621	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 02/24/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/803,374

Applicant(s)

MENON ET AL.

Examiner

Salvatore Carigialosi

Art Unit

3621

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 March 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 3/18/04 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 3621

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

2. Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over any of West, Jr. et al (4922517) or Beeson, Jr. et al (5278890) or Bannister et al (5787355) or Kao (6175737).

Regarding claim 1, each of West, Jr. et al (See abstract, Figs. 1 and 2) or Beeson, Jr. et al (See abstract, Figs. 1,2 and 4) or Bannister et al (See abstract, Fig. 1A, and Col. 1, lines 10-65) or Kao (See abstract, Fig. 1) disclose a means for switching wireless calls via a trunk to wireline users substantially as claimed. The differences between the above and the claimed invention is the use of explicit nomenclature. It is noted that host is believed that most cellular base stations connect via trunks to wireline users at the control of a central telephone switch especially if the call originates with the

Art Unit: 3621

wireline user. It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for West, Jr. et al, Beeson, Jr. et al, Bannister et al, or Kao because telephone switching shown in the prior art are conventional functional equivalents of the claimed limitations. Regarding trunk limitation of claim 2, each of West, Jr. et al (See abstract, Figs. 1 and 2) or Beeson, Jr. et al (See abstract, Figs. 1,2 and 4) or Bannister et al (See abstract, Fig. 1A, and Col. 1, lines 10-65) or Kao (See abstract, Fig. 1) disclose switching wireless calls via a trunk to wireline users including both wireless and wireline trunks that are the functional equivalent of the claimed limitations. Regarding switch limitations of claim 3, each of West, Jr. et al (See abstract, Figs. 1 and 2) or Beeson, Jr. et al (See abstract, Figs. 1,2 and 4) or Bannister et al (See abstract, Fig. 1A, and Col. 1, lines 10-65) or Kao (See abstract, Fig. 1) disclose switching wireless calls via a trunk to wireline users including switches that is a functional equivalent of the claimed limitations. Regarding wireless limitations of claim 4, each of West, Jr. et al (See abstract, Figs. 1 and 2) or Beeson, Jr. et al (See abstract, Figs. 1,2 and 4) or Bannister et al (See abstract, Fig. 1A, and Col. 1, lines 10-65) or Kao (See abstract, Fig. 1) disclose switching wireless calls via a trunk to wireline users including ports and transceivers that is a functional equivalent of the claimed limitations. Regarding the format limitations claim 5,

Art Unit: 3621

each of West, Jr. et al (See abstract, Figs. 1 and 2) or Beeson, Jr. et al (See abstract, Figs. 1,2 and 4) or Bannister et al (See abstract, Fig. 1A, and Col. 1, lines 10-65) or Kao (See abstract, Fig. 1) disclose switching wireless calls via a trunk to wireline users including formatting that is a functional equivalent of the claimed limitations. Regarding trunk limitation of claim 6, each of West, Jr. et al (See abstract, Figs. 1 and 2) or Beeson, Jr. et al (See abstract, Figs. 1,2 and 4) or Bannister et al (See abstract, Fig. 1A, and Col. 1, lines 10-65) or Kao (See abstract, Fig. 1) disclose switching wireless calls via a trunk to wireline users including trunks that are the functional equivalent of the claimed limitations. Regarding call limitations of claims 7-11, each of West, Jr. et al (See abstract, Figs. 1 and 2) or Beeson, Jr. et al (See abstract, Figs. 1,2 and 4) or Bannister et al (See abstract, Fig. 1A, and Col. 1, lines 10-65) or Kao (See abstract, Fig. 1) disclose switching wireless calls via a trunk to wireline users including standard telephone protocols that is a functional equivalent of the claimed limitations. Regarding claim 12, each of West, Jr. et al (See abstract, Figs. 1 and 2) or Beeson, Jr. et al (See abstract, Figs. 1,2 and 4) or Bannister et al (See abstract, Fig. 1A, and Col. 1, lines 10-65) or Kao (See abstract, Fig. 1) disclose a method for switching wireless calls via a trunk to wireline users substantially as claimed. The differences between the above and the claimed invention is the use of explicit nomenclature. It is noted that host is believed that

Art Unit: 3621

most cellular base stations connect via trunks to wireline users at the control of a central telephone switch especially if the call originates with the wireline user. It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for West, Jr. et al, Beeson, Jr. et al, Bannister et al, or Kao because telephone switching shown in the prior art are conventional functional equivalents of the claimed limitations. Regarding reception limitations of claim 13, each of West, Jr. et al (See abstract, Figs. 1 and 2) or Beeson, Jr. et al (See abstract, Figs. 1,2 and 4) or Bannister et al (See abstract, Fig. 1A, and Col. 1, lines 10-65) or Kao (See abstract, Fig. 1) disclose switching wireless calls via a trunk to wireline users including standard telephone switching that is a functional equivalent of the claimed limitations. Regarding the format limitations claim 14, each of West, Jr. et al (See abstract, Figs. 1 and 2) or Beeson, Jr. et al (See abstract, Figs. 1,2 and 4) or Bannister et al (See abstract, Fig. 1A, and Col. 1, lines 10-65) or Kao (See abstract, Fig. 1) disclose switching wireless calls via a trunk to wireline users including format conversion between the many wireless formats to allow a successful call that is a functional equivalent of the claimed limitations. Regarding trunk limitation of claim 15, each of West, Jr. et al (See abstract, Figs. 1 and 2) or Beeson, Jr. et al (See abstract, Figs. 1,2 and 4) or Bannister et al (See abstract, Fig. 1A, and Col. 1, lines 10-65) or Kao (See abstract,

Art Unit: 3621

Fig. 1) disclose switching wireless calls via a trunk to wireline users including trunks that are the functional equivalent of the claimed limitations. Regarding call limitations of claims 16-18, each of West, Jr. et al (See abstract, Figs. 1 and 2) or Beeson, Jr. et al (See abstract, Figs. 1,2 and 4) or Bannister et al (See abstract, Fig. 1A, and Col. 1, lines 10-65) or Kao (See abstract, Fig. 1) disclose switching wireless calls via a trunk to wireline users including standard telephone protocols that is a functional equivalent of the claimed limitations. Regarding claim 19, each of West, Jr. et al (See abstract, Figs. 1 and 2) or Beeson, Jr. et al (See abstract, Figs. 1,2 and 4) or Bannister et al (See abstract, Fig. 1A, and Col. 1, lines 10-65) or Kao (See abstract, Fig. 1) disclose a method for switching wireless calls via a trunk to wireline users substantially as claimed. The differences between the above and the claimed invention is the use of explicit nomenclature. It is noted that host is believed that most cellular base stations connect via trunks to wireline users at the control of a central telephone switch especially if the call originates with the wireline user. It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for West, Jr. et al, Beeson, Jr. et al, Bannister et al, or Kao because telephone switching shown in the prior art are conventional functional equivalents of the claimed limitations. Regarding reception limitations of claim 20, each of West, Jr. et al (See abstract, Figs. 1 and 2) or

Art Unit: 3621

Beeson, Jr. et al (See abstract, Figs. 1,2 and 4) or Bannister et al (See abstract, Fig. 1A, and Col. 1, lines 10-65) or Kao (See abstract, Fig. 1) disclose switching wireless calls via a trunk to wireline users including standard telephone switching that is a functional equivalent of the claimed limitations. Regarding the format limitations claim 21, each of West, Jr. et al (See abstract, Figs. 1 and 2) or Beeson, Jr. et al (See abstract, Figs. 1,2 and 4) or Bannister et al (See abstract, Fig. 1A, and Col. 1, lines 10-65) or Kao (See abstract, Fig. 1) disclose switching wireless calls via a trunk to wireline users including format conversion between the many wireless formats to allow a successful call that is a functional equivalent of the claimed limitations. Regarding call limitations of claim 22, each of West, Jr. et al (See abstract, Figs. 1 and 2) or Beeson, Jr. et al (See abstract, Figs. 1,2 and 4) or Bannister et al (See abstract, Fig. 1A, and Col. 1, lines 10-65) or Kao (See abstract, Fig. 1) disclose switching wireless calls via a trunk to wireline users including standard telephone protocols that is a functional equivalent of the claimed limitations. Regarding claim 23, each of West, Jr. et al (See abstract, Figs. 1 and 2) or Beeson, Jr. et al (See abstract, Figs. 1,2 and 4) or Bannister et al (See abstract, Fig. 1A, and Col. 1, lines 10-65) or Kao (See abstract, Fig. 1) disclose a means for switching wireless calls via a trunk to wireline users substantially as claimed. The differences between the above and the claimed invention is the use of

Art Unit: 3621

explicit nomenclature. It is noted that host is believed that most cellular base stations connect via trunks to wireline users at the control of a central telephone switch especially if the call originates with the wireline user. It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for West, Jr. et al, Beeson, Jr. et al, Bannister et al, or Kao because telephone switching shown in the prior art are conventional functional equivalents of the claimed limitations. Regarding routing limitation of claim 24, each of West, Jr. et al (See abstract, Figs. 1 and 2) or Beeson, Jr. et al (See abstract, Figs. 1,2 and 4) or Bannister et al (See abstract, Fig. 1A, and Col. 1, lines 10-65) or Kao (See abstract, Fig. 1) disclose switching wireless calls via a trunk to wireline users including standard telephone routing that are the functional equivalent of the claimed limitations. Regarding exchange limitations of claim 25, each of West, Jr. et al (See abstract, Figs. 1 and 2) or Beeson, Jr. et al (See abstract, Figs. 1,2 and 4) or Bannister et al (See abstract, Fig. 1A, and Col. 1, lines 10-65) or Kao (See abstract, Fig. 1) disclose switching wireless calls via a trunk to wireline users including pbx that is a functional equivalent of the claimed limitations. Regarding wireless limitations of claim 26, each of West, Jr. et al (See abstract, Figs. 1 and 2) or Beeson, Jr. et al (See abstract, Figs. 1,2 and 4) or Bannister et al (See abstract, Fig. 1A, and Col. 1, lines 10-65) or Kao (See abstract, Fig. 1)

Serial Number: 10/803,374

9

Art Unit: 3621

disclose switching wireless calls via a trunk to wireline users including ports and transceivers that is a functional equivalent of the claimed limitations.

Examiner's Note: Although Examiner has cited particular columns, line numbers and figures in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant(s), the specified citations are merely representative of the teaching of the prior art that are applied to specific limitations within the individual claim and other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested that the applicant(s), in preparing the response, fully consider the items of evidence in their entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Salvatore Cangialosi at telephone number **(571) 272-6927**. The examiner can normally be reached 6:30 Am to 5:00 PM, Tuesday through Friday. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Trammell, can be reached at **(571) 272-6712**.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner for Patents

Serial Number: 10/803,374

10

Art Unit: 3621

P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

or faxed to (571)273-8300

Hand delivered responses should be brought to

United States Patent and Trademark Office
Customer Service Window
Randolph Building
401 Dulany Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 3600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (571) 272-3600.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Shirley C. Cusack
Shirley C. Cusack
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 3621